



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/645,312	08/20/2003	Taeyoung Yoon	58288 (72021)	7622
21874	7590	02/13/2006		EXAMINER
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP				TUCKER, ZACHARY C
P.O. BOX 55874			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOSTON, MA 02205			1624	

DATE MAILED: 02/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Response to Rule 312 Communication	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/645,312	YOON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zachary C. Tucker	1624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1. The amendment filed on 23 January 2006 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a) entered.
- b) entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c) disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.
- d) disapproved. See explanation below.
- e) entered in part. See explanation below.

An amendment filed under 37 C.F.R. 1.312 is not the proper forum for a request that 118 new claims be added. MPEP 714.16 clearly states that amendments requiring more than a cursory review of the record, and amendments involving excessive editorial changes in the specification or claims should not be entered. The proposed amendment would require more than a cursory review of the record. It would require a checking of each specie recited in the allowed claims and comparing each and every one with each of the one hundred eighteen newly presented claims, at least for determining if antecedent basis in the base claim is provided. It is the opinion of the examiner that the proposed amendment involves excessive editorial changes to the claims, which should have been resolved before prosecution closed

Additionally, MPEP 714.16 states that remarks accompanying an amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.312 should include an explanation of why the amendment was not presented earlier, before allowance, that is. No such explanation has been provided.

An amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.312 is not to be used for continued prosecution. Applicants have secured patent protection for each individual compound named in the allowed claims.

